I negate: Economic sanctions ought not be used to achieve foreign policy objectives.

As ought implies a moral obligation, I value morality. The standard is Respecting Human Dignity because A) Without respect for humanity, life loses all meaning since there is no unique reason living is good. B) Human dignity is the basis for all other moral values because it is a precursor for how we act. Every decision, especially on an international level, attempts to maximize or protect life because it has meaning. Thus, a respect for human dignity ensures other values. And C) Among individuals, there are no natural moral sovereigns and no natural moral slaves. Dignity ensures this innate right because it doesn’t treat people as replaceable. Thus, only a respect for human dignity ensures that all people are treated equally.

My thesis and sole contention argue that economic sanctions respect human dignity by signaling immoral actions. Abrams writes,

Abrams, Elliott,( President of the Ethics and Public Policy Center, The Weekly Standard) . "Words or War; Why Sanctions Are Necessary" (27 July 1998).

**The history of the U.S. human-rights policy shows that "mere" words can sometimes be effective tools.** This is especially so when the regime under attack is pledged to respect common values, whether because it sees itself as part of the West and seeks American approval, as was the case with Latin American (which was pledged to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to the Helsinki Agreement). **But words appear to have little impact on the most savage regimes, those we now call "pariah states,"** such as Libya and Iraq. **Nor did words have much impact in the past decades on the likes of Mussolini and Hitler. Confronted with hard cases, the United States may wish to reinforce its words with economic pressure.** Think of the policymaker's options. **Country A is engaged in very grave human-rights abuses:** a government-organized mob has killed some opposition leaders and burned down a church, and the government has jailed several honest judges and shot five journalists. **Country B has been caught trying to send weapons-grade plutonium and missile-guidance systems to Iraq. Country C has just invaded an island belonging to its neighbor. We could simply denounce these acts** from the podium in the State Department's press-briefing room. **We could send troops to fight,** as we did when Kuwait was overrun and when Grenada's government was hijacked**. However, in situations where words are likely to be ignored but soldiers are unlikely to be sent, without economic sanctions the policymaker's quiver would be empty. To escape the choice** **between words and war, governments for centuries have used economic pressure. Even when sanctions are mostly symbolic, they are still important, for they show that we take seriously what the regime in question is doing.**

Thus, sanctions are a middle ground between war and words. The action of sanctions, even if merely symbolic, show an opposition towards those that disrespect human dignity.

Baldwin, David A. (Ira D. Wallach Professor of World Order Studies, Columbia University) “Prologamena to Thinking about Economic Sanctions and Free Trade” Chicago Journal of International Law. October 1, 2003  
**Economic sanctions are sometimes viewed as so useless and counterproductive that they can be worse than "doing nothing." Even putting aside the rather tricky question of what it means for a nation state to "do nothing," this is misleading**. As a practical matter, "doing nothing" means doing what one would have done if the event provoking consideration of sanctions had not occurred. In other words, **it means carrying on "business as usual."** **And countries that carry on business as usual when confronted by aggression (Iraq's invasion of Kuwait), racism (apartheid in South Africa), nuclear proliferation (India and Pakistan), or other violations of international norms are likely to acquire an image as being indifferent to such behavior.** If they take action to avoid the acquisition of such an image, they are not necessarily behaving in a frivolous or expressive manner. It is often said that laws that are not enforced should be repealed, since unenforced laws tend to undermine respect for the rule of law. Likewise, one could argue that **violations of international norms that go unpunished are likely to weaken such norms**. **The use of economic sanctions to reinforce international norms is not an alternative to instrumental behavior aimed at exercising influence; it is instrumental behavior aimed at exercising influence. Strengthening or maintaining a norm is not an end in itself. The point is to increase the probability of behavior in conformance with such norms.**

Therefore, economic sanctions punish nations who are violating human rights. The implications are two-fold

First, sanctions signal that the targeted nation’s actions are immoral and wrong. Simply carrying on “business as usual” does not properly address these issues.

Second, sanctions can deter future abusers of human rights. Orde Kittrie explains,

Kittrie, Orde F. (Associate Professor of Law, Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law, Arizona State University) “Averting Catastrophe: Why the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty is Losing its Deterrence Capacity and How to Restore it” Michigan Journal of International Law, Vol. 28:337. Winter 2007. http://ssrn.com/abstract=996953

Regardless of whether **sanctions** succeed in changing the target leadership’s intentions or capabilities, they **can change the cost-benefit calculations of, and thus deter, other actors that might be contemplating objectionable activities. Sanctions contribute to achieving deterrence when such other actors, observing the imposition of sanctions on the target, increase their assessments of the likelihood or cost of sanctions being imposed on them if they engage in activities objectionable to the sender.**